

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN OFFICIAL REPORTS

California Rules of Court, rule 977(a), prohibits courts and parties from citing or relying on opinions not certified for publication or ordered published, except as specified by rule 977(b). This opinion has not been certified for publication or ordered published for purposes of rule 977.

IN THE COURT OF APPEAL OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

FOURTH APPELLATE DISTRICT

DIVISION TWO

In re S.H., a Person Coming Under the
Juvenile Court Law.

SAN BERNARDINO COUNTY
DEPARTMENT OF CHILDREN'S
SERVICES,

Plaintiff and Respondent,

v.

A.H.,

Defendant and Appellant.

E036249

(Super.Ct.No. J185013)

OPINION

APPEAL from the Superior Court of San Bernardino County. Raymond L.
Haight, Temporary Judge. (Pursuant to Cal. Const., art. VI, § 21.) Affirmed.

Roni Keller, under appointment by the Court of Appeal, for Defendant and
Appellant.

No appearance for Respondent.

No appearance for Minor.

A.H. (father), the father of S.H. (child), appeals from an order terminating his paternal rights. Neither mother nor the child's four half siblings by other fathers are parties to this appeal.

The child is presently three years old. At his birth, he and his mother tested positive for methamphetamines. The San Bernardino County Department of Children's Services filed a petition pursuant to Welfare and Institutions Code, section 300, subdivisions (b) and (g)¹ on behalf of the child. It alleged that mother and father had a history of domestic violence and that mother has a substance abuse problem that affects her ability to care for the child. It further alleged that father's whereabouts was not known, that father had a criminal history and a history of drug and alcohol abuse.

A jurisdictional/dispositional hearing was held on November 21, 2002. The child was declared a dependent of the court and placed along with his half siblings with the maternal great-grandmother.

When the great-grandmother died, the child was placed along with two of his half siblings in the home of maternal cousins, Mr. and Mrs. A., where they have remained and done very well. Mr. and Mrs. A. want to adopt the child and are willing to facilitate visitation with the two half siblings that are not residing with them.

Six-month (§ 366.21, subd. (e)) and 12-month (§ 366.21, subd. (f)) review hearings were held. At the 12-month review hearing held on February 4, 2004, the court terminated reunification services and referred the case for a selection and implementation hearing (§ 366.26).

¹ All further statutory references are to this code unless otherwise stated.

Father filed a petition for writ review arguing that the reunification services offered were not adequate and wrongfully terminated. We denied the writ. (*A.H. v. Superior Court* (Mar. 26, 2004, E035221) [nonpub. opn.].)

On July 12, 2004, the court held the contested selection and implementation hearing. The court found adoption to be the most appropriate plan and terminated parental rights.

Father has appealed and at his request we have appointed counsel to represent him. Counsel has filed a brief under authority of *In re Sade C.* (1996) 13 Cal.4th 952 and *Anders v. California* (1967) 386 U.S. 738, setting forth a statement of the case and a statement of facts and requesting this court to undertake an independent review of the entire record.

We provided father with an opportunity to file a personal supplemental brief, but he has not done so.

We have now completed our independent review and find no arguable issues.

The judgment is affirmed.

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN OFFICIAL REPORTS

/s/ McKinster
Acting P.J.

We concur:

/s/ Richli
J.

/s/ Gaut
J.